

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-12 and 15-32 are pending in the application and currently stand rejected. Entry of the present amendment and further examination of the present application in view of the following remarks are hereby requested.

### **Interview**

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended in the telephonic interview conducted on February 29, 2012. During the interview, the Examiner provided helpful suggestions for potential amendments that would advance prosecution. The Examiner agreed to reconsider the §103 rejection in view of the remarks and amendments submitted herein.

### **Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1-12 and 15-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,987,508, hereinafter "Agraharam," US 2001/0039592, hereinafter "Carden," and US 6,788,769, hereinafter "Waites" in view of well-known technique in the art. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this ground of rejection.

Applicants submit that Agraharam fails to teach or suggest at least "said verification comprising determining that the claim is pending and receiving additional confirmation that the claim should be activated and prompting for entry of the source phone number when the at least one phone number is not detected by the phone call detection device" as recited in amended claim 1.

Agraharam is generally directed to providing e-mail connectivity on a telephone network (see Agraharam, Abstract). Agraharam, at column 6, lines 24-58 (cited by the Examiner in the Office Action), states that "[t]he IVR system detects the phone number of the calling party ... and verifies that the telephone number and the PIN match, and then activates the alias mechanism." Agraharam thus discloses verifying a request for email aliasing using a PIN. However, Agraharam does not teach or suggest "said verification comprising determining that the claim is pending and receiving additional confirmation that the claim should be activated and prompting for entry of the source phone number when the at least one phone number is not detected by the phone call detection device" as recited in claim 1.

Carden does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Agraharam. Carden (see Abstract and paragraph 20) merely discloses assigning a web address that includes a telephone number in the actual web address. Verification can also be performed:

48. This information may be used to verify that the applicant is the person or entity to whom the issuing phone company has assigned the selected phone number. Other methods for verifying that a phone number is registered only to the actual owner of that phone number may also be envisioned. Presently contemplated methods for ensuring that only the proper entity registers the phone number belonging to that entity include verifying ownership via a return phone call to the telephone number, providing a password to the number sought to be registered, restricting registration of a phone number to applicants who are actually accessing the server via the telephone line associated with the phone number for which registration is sought, or an e-mail communication or some other verifiable communication.

However, Carden does not teach or suggest “said verification comprising determining that the claim is pending and receiving additional confirmation that the claim should be activated and prompting for entry of the source phone number when the at least one phone number is not detected by the phone call detection device” as recited in amended claim 1.

Waites does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Agraharam and Carden. Waites describes signing up for a service using a phone number:

As shown, in step 202 the user of computer 112A or telephony device 132 who desires an email address and/or web page host may contact the server 102 and sign up for a service. The user may provide his home telephone number, including area code and local telephone number. In one embodiment where the telephony device 132 is used for this purpose, the user's telephone 132 may provide caller ID information to the server 102, and the server 102 may receive and use the caller ID information to obtain one or more of the user's name and telephone number. The user may provide other information to the server 102, such as names of family members, etc.

However, Waites does not teach or suggest “said verification comprising determining that the claim is pending and receiving additional confirmation that the claim should be activated and

prompting for entry of the source phone number when the at least one phone number is not detected by the phone call detection device” as recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, Agraharam, Carden, and Waites, separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least the aforementioned features of amended claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1, and claims 2-7 which depend on claim 1, is respectfully requested.

Each of independent claims 8, 15, 20, 25, and 29 recite similar features as claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8, 15, 20, 25, and 29, and claims 9-12, 16-19, 21-24, 26-28, and 30-32, which depend on independent claims 8, 15, 20, 25, and 29, is respectfully requested.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of all pending claims. Should the examiner have any further suggestions for expediting the prosecution of the presently pending claims, the undersigned respectfully asks the examiner contact him at 206-903-2474.

Date: March 5, 2012

/Han Gim/  
Han Gim  
Registration No. 62,953

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439